REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-83 were previously pending in this Application. Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1-83 have been rejected. By the above amendment, Claims 1, 20 and 66 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-83 are now pending in the application.

Objections to the Claims

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-33 and 66-82 have been objected to for not being clear if the functionality associated with the middleware filter defines the structure of the middleware filter or describes the intended use of the middleware filter. Based on the Examiner's suggestion, the claims have been amended to clearly claim that the computer is programmed to perform the functionality. Thus, the objections should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1-18 and 20-83 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,341,316 to Kloba et al. (hereinafter "Kloba"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kloba teaches a system, method and computer program product for synchronizing content between a server and a client based on state information. Kloba teaches systems for enabling web content to be loaded on mobile devices, and for users of devices to operate with such web content on their mobile devices in an interactive manner while in an off-line mode. [Kloba, Abstract] Kloba teaches that the mobile device is placed into an adapter to synchronize a mobile client with a server. [Kloba, col. 5, lines 41-52] Kloba does not teach *filtering* the content and *sending only filtered content* to a device. Kloba does not teach a *middleware filter* that *selectively sends* content received from the content server to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that *selected content* is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process.

In contrast to the teachings of Kloba, the middleware filter agent of the presently claimed invention, *selectively filters* the content provided by the content server such that *only selected content* is provided to a first network device. A content server provides content to the first network device during a data synchronization between the two devices. The *middleware filter selectively filters* the content provided by the content server such that selected content is provided

to the first network device. The middleware filter is preferably included within a second network device coupled between the content server and the first network device. In this manner, the second network device acts as a proxy for the first network device to receive the content provided by the content server. In an alternative embodiment, the content server is coupled to the first network device, without the second network device coupled in between. The middleware filter is included within the content server, and the content is *selectively provided* from the middleware filter, on the content server, to the first network device. As described above, Kloba does not teach *filtering* the content and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach a *middleware filter* that *selectively sends content* received from the content server to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process.

Within the Office Action, it is argued that at Column 14, lines 46-50 Kloba teaches filtering content and selectively sending the filtered content by sending changed objects, possibly involving only a subset of providers. Further, it is argued that the server 104 of Kloba corresponds to the claimed middleware filter and that the providers 128 correspond to the claimed content servers. As described above, Kloba does not teach a *middleware filter* that *selectively sends content received* from the content server to the first network device. The following are the sections from Kloba cited within the Office Action. As can be seen, none of the cited sections teach that a middleware filter receives content from a content server, the middleware filter then selectively filters the content and then the middleware filter sends the filtered content to the first network device.

The first cited section is:

> In one embodiment, a sync operation involves a user placing a mobile device into an adapter that includes a sync button. The adapter is connected to a server. Upon pressing the sync button, the user initiates the sync operations of the present invention, which include various synchronization processes (specific delivery modes). Thus, the term sync is meant to refer to the overall operation of linking a client to a server. Synchronization is meant to refer to the specific process of copying, adding, filtering, removing, updating and merging the information between a client and a server. Any number of synchronization processes can be executed during a sync. [Kloba, col. 5, lines 41-52]

While this section of Kloba describes synchronization to include filtering, there is nothing that details the specifics of the claimed invention such that a middleware filter receives content from a content server, the middleware filter then selectively filters the content and then the middleware filter sends the filtered content to the first network device.

The second cited section is:

> [i]n step 202, top level resources that server 104 needs to fulfill client 108's request are identified by server 104. For example, if *client 108 is requesting* a full synchronization, server 104 will identify any changed objects from providers 128 and send them to client 108. *Client 108 can also request* that a subset of providers 128 be updated. Server 104 will identify any changed objects within the subset of providers 128 and send them to client 108. [Kloba, col. 14, lines 46-53, emphasis added]

Kloba merely teaches that the server 104 identifies any changed objects from providers 128 and sends them to the client 108. Contrastingly, the claimed invention claims the middleware filter receiving content from the content server, then the middleware filter selectively filtering the content and then the middleware filter sending the filtered content to the first network device.

In a step by step comparison, it can be shown as:

Kloba: Server 104 identifies changed objects –> Server 104 sends changed objects to client 108.

Present Invention: Middleware filter receives content –> Middleware filter filters the content –> Middleware filter sends filtered content to the first network device.

Thus, clearly, Kloba, at column 14, lines 29-53 does not teach the claimed invention.

The third cited section within the Office Action is:

> Adapter 118 reads data from the client 108 (step 172M). Specifically, adapter interface module 116 reads data from client 108 that includes state information about the resources of the device 106, user specific information, etc.
>
> Adapter 118 identifies deltas in client databases identified by server 104 in step 168B (step 172N). Adapter 118 sends these deltas to synchronization module(s) 155 via server extension module 156 (step 1720). Such deltas are transmitted in the initial synchronization request, thus effecting a "one-up" protocol.
>
> As discussed above, synchronization module(s) 155 on server 104 synchronize deltas from adapter 118 with providers 128 (step 172P). Synchronization module(s) 155 compile instructions to synchronize client 108 with providers 128 (step 172Q). These instructions are transmitted to the adapter 118, along with the updated data marker (step 172R). This is the only transmission from the server 104 to the adapter 118 during the synchronization process, thus effecting a "one-down" protocol. Adapter 118 then writes the updated data to client 108 (step 172T). [Kloba, col. 20, lines 15-34]

Again, although Kloba discusses deltas in client databases identified by server 104 and synchronizing deltas from adapter 118 with providers 128, Kloba does not teach a middleware filter receives content from a content server, the middleware filter then selectively filters the content and then the middleware filter sends the filtered content to the first network device.

As discussed above, none of the cited sections of Kloba teach that a middleware filter receives content from a content server, the middleware filter then selectively filters the content and then the middleware filter sends the filtered content to the first network device. To view otherwise, is reading more into Kloba than is actually taught. Therefore, the rejection of the claimed invention based on Kloba should be withdrawn.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a network of devices to filter synchronized data. The network of devices of Claim 1 comprises a content server to store content, a first network device and a middleware filter coupled to the first network device and to the content server such that during a data synchronization, *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server* according to the data synchronization and the *middleware filter is programmed to selectively filter the content resulting in filtered content and send only the filtered content* to the first network device. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content and sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach a *middleware filter* that *selectively sends content* received from the content server to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Claims 2-18 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claims 2-18 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 20 is directed to a network of devices to filter synchronized data. The network of devices of Claim 20 comprises a content server to store content, a personal digital assistant and a personal computer coupled to the personal digital assistant and to the content server, wherein the personal computer includes a middleware filter programmed such that during a data synchronization, content received by the personal computer from the content server according to the data synchronization is *selectively filtered according to the middleware filter resulting in filtered content, wherein only filtered content is sent* to the personal digital assistant by the personal computer. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content* and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach a *middleware filter* that

selectively sends content received from the content server to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Claims 21-33 are all dependent on the independent Claim 20. As described above, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claims 21-33 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 34 is directed to a method of filtering synchronized data. The method of Claim 34 comprises determining content to be sent from a content server to a first network device during a data synchronization, sending the content from the content server to a second network device coupled between the content server and the first network device, wherein the second network device includes a *middleware filter*, *selectively filtering the content* according to the middleware filter and *sending the filtered content* from the second network device to the first network device. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content* and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach *selectively filtering the content* according to the *middleware filter* and *sending the filtered content* from the second network device to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 34 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Claims 35-50 are all dependent on the independent Claim 34. As described above, the independent Claim 34 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claims 35-50 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 51 is directed to a method of filtering synchronized data. The method of Claim 51 comprises determining content to be sent from a content server to a first network device during a data synchronization, wherein the content server includes a *middleware filter*, *selectively filtering the determined content* according to the *middleware filter* and *sending the filtered content* from the content server to the first network device. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content* and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach *selectively filtering the content* according to the *middleware filter* and *sending the filtered content* from the content server to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 51 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Claims 52-65 are all dependent on the independent Claim 51. As described above, the independent Claim 51 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claims 52-65 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 66 is directed to an apparatus to filter synchronized data wherein the apparatus includes a middleware filter programmed such that during a data synchronization, content is received by the apparatus from a content server according to the data synchronization and the *received content is selectively sent* to a network device by the apparatus according to the *middleware filter*. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content* and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach *selectively filtering the content* according to the *middleware filter* and *sending the received content* to a network device by the apparatus. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 66 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Claims 67-82 are all dependent on the independent Claim 66. As described above, the independent Claim 66 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claims 67-82 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 83 is directed to an apparatus for filtering synchronized data. The apparatus of Claim 83 comprises means for determining content to be sent from a content server to a first network device during a data synchronization, means for sending the content from the content server to a second network device coupled between the content server and the first network device, wherein the second network device includes a middleware filter, means for *selectively filtering the content* according to the *middleware filter* and means for *sending the filtered content* from the second network device to the first network device. As described above, Kloba does not teach *content is received by the middleware filter from the content server, filtering the content* and *sending only filtered content* to a device. As further described above, Kloba does not teach means for *selectively filtering the content* according to the *middleware filter* and means for *sending the filtered content* from the second network device to the first network device. Kloba merely teaches that selected content is sent to the mobile device during a synchronization process. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 83 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba.

Claim 19 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Kloba. Accordingly, Claim 19 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, the applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: June 13, 2008 By: /Jonathan O. Owens/

Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902
Attorneys for Applicant(s)